

ℓ_0 -PENALIZED MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD FOR SPARSE DIRECTED ACYCLIC GRAPHS

Sara van de Geer and Peter Bühlmann

Seminar for Statistics, ETH Zürich

Abstract

We consider the problem of regularized maximum likelihood estimation for the structure and parameters of a high-dimensional, sparse directed acyclic graphical (DAG) model with Gaussian distribution, or equivalently, of a Gaussian structural equation model. We show that the ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimator of a DAG has about the same number of edges as the minimal-edge I-MAP (a DAG with minimal number of edges representing the distribution), and that it converges in Frobenius norm. We allow the number of nodes p to be much larger than sample size n but assume a sparsity condition and that any representation of the true DAG has at least a fixed proportion of its non-zero edge weights above the noise level. Our results do not rely on the restrictive strong faithfulness condition which is required for methods based on conditional independence testing such as the PC-algorithm.

1 Introduction

Directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) and corresponding directed graphical models are key concepts for causal inference, see for example the books by Spirtes et al. [2000] and Pearl [2000]. From an estimation point of view, a first step consists in estimating the Markov equivalence class of the true underlying causal DAG based on observational data, and from this, one infers identifiable causal effects and lower bounds for all causal effects [Maathuis et al., 2009]. This strategy has been applied to, and to a certain extent validated using high-throughput, and hence high-dimensional, data in biology [Maathuis et al., 2010]. It is of primary importance to understand limitations and potential of methods in terms of subtle and often uncheckable assumptions, and in this respect, our results here shed new light.

We focus here on the problem of estimating the Markov equivalence class of DAGs (or more generally of a so-called minimal-edge I-MAP) in the setting of observational Gaussian data where the number p of variables or nodes in the DAG may greatly exceed sample size n . We consider the ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimator, and we relate and compare our new results and conditions to the popular PC-algorithm [Spirtes et al., 2000] and its theoretical analysis. To the best of our knowledge, the latter is so far the only work providing theoretical guarantees for inferring the Markov equivalence class of DAGs in the high-dimensional setting. We emphasize that the popular ℓ_1 -norm regularization of the likelihood is inappropriate here, leading to an objective function which is not constant over equivalent DAGs encoding the same distribution. On the other hand, ℓ_0 -penalization leads to invariant scores over

equivalent DAGs. The computational difficulties are primarily due to the non-convex constraint that the directed graph should be acyclic, and the additional complication of the ℓ_0 - in comparison to e.g. ℓ_1 -norm penalization is rather marginal. A computationally feasible algorithm for exact ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimation for the Markov equivalence class of DAGs has been proposed by Silander and Myllymäki [2006]; for larger graphs, with more than about 20 nodes, approximate algorithms can be used [Chickering, 2002, Hauser and Bühlmann, 2011].

1.1 Relation to other work

We analyze the ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimator for the equivalence class of DAGs in the Gaussian setting. Pioneering work for the low-dimensional case on this problem has been done by Chickering [2002] who proved consistency of the BIC-score and provided an algorithm, called greedy equivalent search (GES), which greedily proceeds in the space of Markov equivalence classes. While the GES-algorithm can also be used in the high-dimensional scenario [Hauser and Bühlmann, 2011], the asymptotic consistency of BIC is established only for the case with a fixed distribution (with $p < \infty$) where the sample size $n \rightarrow \infty$. Chickering’s first significant analysis does not provide any insights for the high-dimensional case with its subtle interplay of signal strength, noise level and identifiability conditions.

Robins et al. [2003] present refined analyses for causal inference under the view point of uniform consistency as sample size $n \rightarrow \infty$. There, problematic issues with the so-called faithfulness condition (see Section 1.2) arise, and Zhang and Spirtes [2003] introduce the notion of strong faithfulness (see (2)), as a way to address some of the the raised major problems. None of these works consider high-dimensional inference, but their pointing to the faithfulness condition and its version are important.

Kalisch and Bühlmann [2007] provide consistency results of the PC-algorithm [Spirtes et al., 2000] for estimating the Markov equivalence class of DAGs based on Gaussian observational data, in the high-dimensional, sparse setting. One of the conditions used is a restricted version of strong faithfulness in (2) modified for sparse problems, see (3). Our analysis with the penalized MLE is completely different and circumvents such strong faithfulness conditions which are often very restrictive as shown by Uhler et al. [2012].

The theoretical high-dimensional analysis presented here is very different and more challenging than for multivariate regression or covariance estimation, due to the *unknown* order among the variables. For known order, as e.g. in time series problem, Shojaie and Michailidis [2010] present results for estimation of high-dimensional DAGs; but the case with unknown order considered in the present paper requires major new theoretical ideas and development.

1.2 Directed graphical and structural equation models

Consider the following model. There is a DAG D_0 whose p nodes correspond to random variables $X_1, \dots, X_p$: assume that

$$\begin{aligned} X_1, \dots, X_p &\sim \mathcal{N}_p(0, \Sigma_0) \text{ with density } f_{\Sigma_0}(\cdot), \\ \mathcal{N}_p(0, \Sigma_0) &\text{ is Markovian with respect to } D_0, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the Markov property can be understood as the factorization property where the joint Gaussian density $f_{\Sigma_0}(x_1, \dots, x_p)$ can be factorized as

$$f_{\Sigma_0}(x_1, \dots, x_p) = \prod_{j=1}^p f_{\Sigma_0}(x_j | x_{\text{pa}(j)}),$$

with $\text{pa}(j)$ denoting the set of parents of node j [Lauritzen, 1996, cf.].

It is well-known that in general, there exists another DAG D such that the distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$ is Markovian with respect to D . The set of all such other DAGs build the so-called Markov equivalence class $\mathcal{E}(D_0)$ which can be characterized in terms of a bi-directed graph [Andersson et al., 1997, cf.]. The Markov equivalence class $\mathcal{E}(D_0)$ can be identified from the observational data distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$ under the assumption of faithfulness.

Definition of faithfulness [Spirtes et al., 2000, cf.]: For a DAG D , a distribution P is called *faithful* with respect to D if and only if all conditional independences are encoded by the DAG D .

Faithfulness is stronger than a Markov assumption: the latter allows to infer some conditional independences from the DAG while the former requires that *all* of them can be inferred from the DAG (i.e. also the ones which are entailed by a Markov condition). Failure of faithfulness is “rare”, having Lebesgue measure zero, if the edge weights (the coefficients in the equivalent linear structural equation model) are chosen from a distribution which is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure. However, for statistical estimation, we often require sufficiently strong detectability of conditional dependencies, given by the notion of strong faithfulness.

Definition of strong faithfulness in the Gaussian case [Zhang and Spirtes, 2003]: For a DAG D , a Gaussian distribution P is called τ -strongly faithful with respect to D if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{&|\text{Parcorr}(X_j, X_k | X_S)|; \text{Parcorr}(X_j, X_k | X_S) \neq 0, \\ &S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{j, k\}, j, k \in \{1, \dots, p\} (j \neq k)\} \geq \tau. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

A typical requirement is strong faithfulness with $\tau \asymp \sqrt{\text{sparsity} \cdot \log(p)/n}$, see also below for the PC-algorithm. Strong faithfulness can be viewed as a condition of “signal strength” in terms of non-zero partial correlations. As shown in

Uhler et al. [2012], strong faithfulness is a very restrictive condition for many DAGs. At the same time, it is essentially unavoidable for any algorithm for inferring the Markov equivalence class $\mathcal{E}(D_0)$ which relies on conditional independence testing. The most prominent example is the PC-algorithm [Spirtes et al., 2000]: consistent estimation for the Markov equivalence class $\mathcal{E}(D_0)$ is proved in Kalisch and Bühlmann [2007] for the Gaussian case assuming a restricted strong faithfulness condition

$$\min\{|\text{Parcorr}(X_j, X_k|X_S)|; \text{Parcorr}(X_j, X_k|X_S) \neq 0, \\ S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{j, k\}, |S| \leq d, j, k \in \{1, \dots, p\} (j \neq k)\} \geq \tau, \quad (3)$$

where d is the maximal degree of the skeleton of D_0 (the undirected graph when deleting all arrow directions in D_0), and essentially for $\tau \asymp \sqrt{d \log(p)/n}$. In comparison to (2), the restriction is exploiting sparsity by looking only at sets S with $|S| \leq d$, see Bühlmann and van de Geer [2011, Th.13.1]; but also such restricted strong faithfulness remains as a stringent condition [Uhler et al., 2012]. The results in this paper for the ℓ_0 -penalized MLE do not require a strong faithfulness condition as in (2) or (3): the reason is that the method is *not* relying on conditional independence testing but rather on penalized parameter estimation in terms of a linear structural equation model as explained next.

A Gaussian DAG model as in (1) can always be equivalently represented as a linear structural equation model:

$$X_j = \sum_{k \in \text{pa}(j)} \beta_{kj}^0 X_k + \epsilon_j \quad (j = 1, \dots, p), \quad (4)$$

where $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n$ are independent, $\epsilon_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, |\omega_j^0|^2)$ and ϵ_j independent of $\{X_k; k \in \text{pa}(j)\}$; note that $\text{pa}(j) = \text{pa}_{D_0}(j)$ depends on the true DAG D_0 .

2 The setting and the estimator

We use here and in the sequel a terminology which does not rely on the standard language from graphical modeling since the required basics for the Gaussian case (see models (1) and (4)) can be developed in a straightforward way.

We consider n i.i.d. observations from the structural equation model (4) which is equivalent to model (1). We denote by $X := (X_1, \dots, X_p)$ the $n \times p$ data matrix with n i.i.d. rows, each of them being $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$ -distributed, where Σ_0 is a non-singular covariance matrix. The relations between the variables in a row can be represented as

$$X = XB_0 + E, \quad (5)$$

where $B_0 := (\beta_{k,j}^0)$ is a $p \times p$ matrix with $\beta_{j,j}^0 = 0$ for all j , and where E as an $n \times p$ matrix of noise vectors $E := (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_p)$, with ϵ_j independent of X_k

whenever $\beta_{k,j}^0 \neq 0$.¹ Furthermore, E has n i.i.d. rows which are $\mathcal{N}(0, \Omega_0)$ -distributed, with $\Omega_0 := \text{diag}(|\omega_1^0|^2, \dots, |\omega_p^0|^2)$ a $p \times p$ diagonal matrix.

The model (5) implies that

$$\Sigma_0 = [(I - B_0)^{-1}]^T \Omega_0 [(I - B_0)^{-1}].$$

We call (B_0, Ω_0) a DAG corresponding to Σ_0 .² The set of edges of this DAG is denoted by $s_0 := s_{B_0} := \{(k, j) : \beta_{k,j}^0 \neq 0\}$, and in fact, $\beta_{k,j}^0 \neq 0$ encodes for a directed edge $k \rightarrow j$. We will assume in Condition 3.4 that (B_0, Ω_0) is sparse, in the sense that its number of (directed) edges s_0 is small.

As described in Section 1.2 with the concept of a Markov equivalence class, there are several DAGs $(\tilde{B}_0, \tilde{\Omega}_0)$ describing the same Σ_0 and thus the same Gaussian distribution $P = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$. Throughout this paper, (B_0, Ω_0) is defined as a DAG with a minimal number of edges. We call such a DAG a minimal-edge I-MAP.³

2.1 The ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimator

We use a penalized maximum likelihood procedure to estimate the DAG (B_0, Ω_0) . Let

$$\Sigma_n := X^T X / n$$

be the empirical covariance matrix based on the observations X . Given a $p \times p$ non-singular covariance matrix Σ , with inverse $\Theta := \Sigma^{-1}$, the minus log-likelihood is proportional to

$$l_n(\Theta) := \text{trace}(\Theta \Sigma_n) - \log \det(\Theta).$$

We consider inverse covariance matrices that can be represented as a DAG. That is, we let

$$\Theta := \Theta(B, \Omega) := (I - B)\Omega^{-1}(I - B)^T,$$

where (B, Ω) is a DAG. The latter means that Ω is a positive diagonal matrix and that, up to a permutation π of the rows and columns, B can be written as a lower-diagonal matrix.

The ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimator is

$$\hat{\Theta} = \arg \min_{B, \Omega} \left\{ l_n(\Theta) + \lambda^2 s_B : \right. \\ \left. \Theta = \Theta(B, \Omega), \text{ for some DAG } (B, \Omega) \text{ with } B \in \mathcal{B} \right\}. \quad (6)$$

¹Note that in relation to the true DAG D_0 in model (4), $\beta_{k,j}^0 = 0$ for $k \notin \text{pa}_{D_0}(j)$. We do not make such explicit constraints here since we aim for a smallest DAG representing the distribution of X .

²This deviates from the classical definition where the DAG is only a (directed acyclic) graph; we use the short terminology ‘‘DAG’’ for the whole graphical model with the distribution and the graph encoded by the coefficient matrix B and the error variances Ω .

³It is a minimal I-MAP [Spirtes et al., 2000, Sec.2.3.1.] with the additional property that it has minimal number of edges.

Here s_B is the number of non-zero elements in B (corresponding to the number of edges in the DAG) and $\lambda \geq 0$ is a tuning parameter. The estimator is denoted by $\hat{\Theta} := \Theta(\hat{B}, \hat{\Omega})$. It has $\hat{s} := s_{\hat{B}}$ edges. The collection $\mathcal{B}$ is the set of all edge weights B of DAGs (B, Ω) which have at most $\alpha n / \log p$ incoming edges (parents) at each node, where $\alpha > 0$ is given (see Condition 3.3), or a subset thereof. We will discuss this restriction in Subsection 4.2. We throughout assume $B_0 \in \mathcal{B}$, i.e. that the restrictions one puts on the edge weights are correct.

The ℓ_0 -penalty in the estimator ensures that the penalized likelihood remains the same among all equivalent representations, e.g., among all DAGs from the same Markov equivalence class or among the equivalence class described in Remark 2.1 below. This would not be true when choosing for example an ℓ_1 -norm penalization, see also Remark 2.2. From a computational point of view, this does not make the problem substantially more complex since the main difficulty is the optimization over the space of DAGs $\mathcal{B}$. For problems with up to about $p \approx 20$ nodes, dynamic programming can be used [Silander and Myllymäki, 2006], while for large-scale applications, greedy equivalent search has been reported to perform well [Chickering, 2002, Hauser and Bühlmann, 2011].

Remark 2.1 *We call two DAGs (B_1, Ω_1) and (B_2, Ω_2) equivalent if $\Theta(B_1, \Omega_1) = \Theta(B_2, \Omega_2)$ and if in addition they have the same number of undirected edges.⁴ In our analysis, we will identify DAGs which are in the same equivalence class. Thus, our aim is to estimate an arbitrary member of the equivalence class of (B_0, Ω_0) , by a suitable member in the equivalence class of $(\hat{B}, \hat{\Omega}_0)$.*

2.1.1 The main results and their implications

We show in Theorem 3.1 that with a choice of the tuning parameter λ^2 of order $\log p / n((p/s_0) \vee 1)$, the number of edges $\hat{s}$ of the estimator is of the same order of magnitude as the number of edges s_0 of the true DAG. Moreover, we show that $\hat{B}$ and $\hat{\Omega}$ converges in Frobenius norm to some $\tilde{B}_0$ and $\tilde{\Omega}_0$ respectively, where $\Theta(\tilde{B}_0, \tilde{\Omega}_0) = \Theta_0$ is a representation of the true DAG with $\tilde{s}$ edges (see Section 2.2), and with $\tilde{s}$ of the same order of magnitude as s_0 . The rate of convergence is of order $\lambda^2 s_0$. To arrive at this result, we need that at least a fixed proportion of the non-zero coefficients of any representation of the true DAG is above the “noise level”, the latter being of order $\sqrt{\log p / n}(\sqrt{p/s_0} \vee 1)$ (see Condition 3.5): in analogy to regression, we call this the “beta-min” condition. Some of our other conditions are trivially satisfied when $p = \mathcal{O}(n / \log(n))$ is sufficiently small.

The “noise level” indicates two regimes for (n, p, s_0) . If s_0 is at least of the order of p (or larger), then the “noise level” is of the order $\sqrt{\log(p)/n}$ which is small even if p is very large relative to n . This scenario is often realistic saying that a fixed non-zero proportion of the nodes has at least one parent: we call it

⁴This definition is not the same as for a Markov equivalence class.

the standard sparsity regime. The other scenario is for $s_0 \ll p$, corresponding to very sparse DAGs, which we call the ultra-high sparsity regime. The reason for the two different noise level scenarios is that we estimate p error variances in Ω_0 : when $s_0 \ll p$, the term from estimating these error variances is dominating.

When making a more stringent “beta-min” condition and choosing the regularization parameter of larger order than the “noise level” (or the same order if $s_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)$), we can recover the minimal-edge I-MAP. When assuming in addition the faithfulness condition (but *not* requiring strong faithfulness), see Section 1.2, we can recover the true underlying Markov equivalence class. This then allows to derive bounds for causal inference, exactly along the lines of Maathuis et al. [2009].

The ℓ_0 -penalized MLE can be easily adapted to the case where the noise variances in Ω_0 are known up to a scalar, for example when all noise variances are known to be equal but their value is unknown. Then, the true DAG can be identified from the distribution [Peters and Bühlmann, 2012]. We show that in this case, under an identifiability condition on the noise variances, the ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimator finds the representation (and hence the true DAG) with the prescribed noise variances, and the rate of convergence for the Frobenius norm is of order $\lambda^2 s_0$ (see Theorem 5.1). We assume in this context that p is sufficiently smaller than $n/\log n$.

Remark 2.2 *The ℓ_0 -penalty $\lambda^2 s_B$ is proportional to the number of edges s_B of B . Alternatively, inspired by the Lasso, one may consider applying a penalty proportional to the ℓ_1 -norm*

$$\|B\|_1 := \sum_{k,j} |\beta_{k,j}|.$$

However, the ℓ_1 -penalized likelihood $l_n(\Theta(B, \Omega)) + \lambda \|B\|_1$ will not be constant within a class of equivalent DAGs. This makes the ℓ_1 -norm penalty less suitable for estimation of DAGs in general. Under the assumption of equal noise variances, however, the ℓ_1 -penalty may be a useful alternative regularizer since the true DAG is identifiable, see Section 5. We omit the details.

2.2 Permutations and the order of the variables

The model (5) can be written as

$$X_j = X\beta_j^0 + \epsilon_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, p,$$

with β_j^0 the j -th column of B_0 . Let us write for any vector $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$\|X\beta\|^2 := \beta^T \Sigma_0 \beta, \quad \|X\beta\|_n^2 := \beta^T \Sigma_n \beta.$$

For a permutation π of $\{1, \dots, p\}$, which plays the role of an order of the variables, we let $\tilde{B}_0(\pi)$ be the matrix obtained by doing a Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization for $\|\cdot\|$, starting with X_{π_p} and finishing by projecting X_{π_1} on

$X_{\pi_2}, \dots, X_{\pi_p}$. Moreover, we let $\tilde{\Omega}_0(\pi)$ be the diagonal matrix of the error variances. Note thus that $\tilde{B}_0(\pi)$ is lower-diagonal after permutation of its rows and columns. Furthermore,

$$\Theta_0 = \Theta_0(\tilde{B}_0(\pi), \tilde{\Omega}_0(\pi)), \forall \pi.$$

The set of incoming edges at node j (non-zero coefficients of the j th column of $\tilde{B}_0(\pi)$) is denoted by $\tilde{S}_j(\pi)$, and we let $\tilde{s}_j(\pi) := |\tilde{S}_j(\pi)|$. Moreover, we let $\tilde{s}(\pi) = \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{s}_j(\pi)$ be the total number of edges of $\tilde{B}_0(\pi)$. Thus, $\tilde{s}(\pi) = s_{\tilde{B}_0(\pi)}$.

Example 2.1 (*AR(1)-model*). Suppose the true DAG is a directed chain from X_p along $X_{p-1}, \dots, X_2$ to X_1 with a corresponding structural equation model:

$$\begin{aligned} X_p &= \epsilon_p, \\ X_j &= \beta^0 X_{j+1} + \epsilon_j \quad (j = 1, \dots, p-1), \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega_0)$ with $\Omega_0 = \text{diag}(1 - (\beta^0)^2, \dots, 1 - (\beta^0)^2, 1)$ and $|\beta^0| < 1$. The error variances are chosen such that $\text{Var}(X_j) = 1$ for all j . The covariance matrix is of Toeplitz form $(\Sigma_0)_{ij} = (\beta^0)^{|i-j|}$ and the model satisfies the directed global Markov property (which is equivalent to the concept of d-separation) [Lauritzen, 1996, cf. Sec.3.2.2]. Therefore, we have that projecting

$$X_{\pi_k} \text{ on } X_{\pi_{k+1}}, \dots, X_{\pi_p} \quad (k = 1, \dots, p-1)$$

leads to at most two non-zero regression coefficients in every column of $\tilde{B}_0(\pi)$ (corresponding to the largest index $j_1 < \pi_k$ and smallest index $j_2 > \pi_k$ if $\pi_{k+1}, \dots, \pi_p$ contains indices smaller and larger than $\pi(k)$; or corresponding to the largest $j < \pi_k$ if $\pi_{k+1}, \dots, \pi_p$ contains only smaller indices than π_k ; or corresponding to the smallest $j > \pi_k$ if $\pi_{k+1}, \dots, \pi_p$ contains only smaller larger indices than $\pi(k)$). Thus, we have that $\tilde{s}_j(\pi) \leq 2$ for all j and all π and hence Condition 3.4, given below, holds.

The absolute values of the non-zero coefficients in $\tilde{B}_0(\pi) = (\tilde{\beta}_{k,j}^0(\pi))$ decrease monotonely as the index-distance $d(j) = \min_{k=j+1, \dots, p} |\pi_k - \pi_j|$ increases. Thus, whenever $d(j) \leq \Delta$ for some (large) value of Δ , there are at most two (since $\tilde{s}_j(\pi) \leq 2$) coefficients with $|\tilde{\beta}_{k,j}^0(\pi)| \leq C(\Delta)$ for some value $C(\Delta)$ (which decreases as Δ increases). Therefore, clearly, there are at most $2(\lfloor p/\Delta \rfloor + 1)$ coefficients (edges) whose values are smaller than $|\tilde{\beta}_{k,j}^0(\pi)| \leq C(\Delta)$, and all other non-zero coefficients (at least $p - \lfloor p/\Delta \rfloor - 2$)⁵ are larger than $C(\Delta)$. For e.g. $\Delta \geq 3$ this implies that there are at most $2(\lfloor p/3 \rfloor + 1)$ edges with non-zero coefficients being smaller than $C(\Delta)$, and at least $p - \lfloor p/3 \rfloor - 2$ edges with non-zero coefficients larger than $C(\Delta)$. This implies that Condition 3.5, given below, holds.

Let $\hat{B}$ - or one of the members in its equivalence class - be lower-diagonal after permutation $\hat{\pi}$, and define $\tilde{B}_0 := B_0(\hat{\pi})$. The number of edges of $\tilde{B}_0$ is denoted

⁵There are at least $p - (\lfloor p/\Delta \rfloor + 1)$ indices (nodes) j with $d(j) \leq \Delta$; and there is at least one non-zero coefficient (edge) from all of them except one (the starting node).

by $\tilde{s} = \tilde{s}(\hat{\pi})$. The DAGs $(\hat{B}, \hat{\Omega})$ and $(\tilde{B}_0, \tilde{\Omega}_0)$ share the same lower-diagonal structure (but not necessarily the same set of zero coefficients). We will show that $\tilde{s} := \tilde{s}(\hat{\pi})$ is with large probability of the same order of magnitude as s_0 (see Theorem 3.1). Thus, if the true DAG (B_0, Ω_0) is sparse, then with large probability the DAG $(\tilde{B}_0(\hat{\pi}), \tilde{\Omega}_0(\hat{\pi}))$ is sparse as well, which means that on average, the number of incoming edges at a node is small.

Note that $\hat{\pi}$ is a random permutation and that there are in total a large number (namely $p!$) permutations. Analytical control over these $p!$ permutations requires a very different technique than dealing with known order [Shojaie and Michailidis, 2010] or with multivariate regression or covariance estimation problems. We explain this in more detail in Section 7.3.1.

3 Conditions and main result

We write $\Sigma_0 =: (\sigma_{k,j})$ and we let $\sigma_j^2 := \sigma_{j,j}$, $j = 1, \dots, p$.

Condition 3.1 *For some constant σ_0^2 , it holds that*

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sigma_j^2 \leq \sigma_0^2.$$

Condition 3.2 *The smallest eigenvalue $\Lambda_{\min}^2$ of Σ_0 is non-zero. (See also (7)).*

Condition 3.3 *For a given constant $\alpha > 0$, it holds that for any $B = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p) \in \mathcal{B}$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is as in (6), that $s_{\beta_j} \leq \alpha n / \log p$ for all $j = 1, \dots, p$, where for a vector $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ we denote the cardinality of its support set by $s_\beta := \#\{\beta_k \neq 0\}$.*

Condition 3.4 *For some constant $\tilde{\alpha}$ and any permutation π , and all j ,*

$$\tilde{s}_j(\pi) \leq \tilde{\alpha} n / \log p,$$

where $\tilde{s}_j(\pi) = s_{\tilde{\beta}_j^0}$ is the number of incoming edges of the DAG $(\tilde{B}_0(\pi), \tilde{\Omega}_0(\pi))$ at node j . (See also (8).)

Condition 3.5 *There exist constants $0 \leq \eta_1 < 1$ and $0 < \eta_0^2 < 1 - \eta_1$, such that for any permutation π , the DAG $(\tilde{B}_0(\pi), \tilde{\Omega}_0(\pi))$ (which has $\tilde{s}(\pi)$ edges) has at least $(1 - \eta_1)\tilde{s}(\pi)$ edges (k, j) with $|\tilde{\beta}_{k,j}^0(\pi)| > \sqrt{\log p / n}(\sqrt{p/s_0} \vee 1)/\eta_0$.*

Following Bühlmann and van de Geer [2011], we refer to Condition 3.5 as the “beta-min” condition. It is a “kind of replacement” of the strong faithfulness condition in (2) that is required for consistency of the PC algorithm and variants thereof, see Section 1.2. A detailed discussion about the assumptions is given in Section 4.

In the current section, we will present an asymptotic formulation for clarity. We will provide a non-asymptotic result in Section 7. Our results depend on Σ_0 via the constants σ_0 , $\Lambda_{\min}$, on the further constants $\gamma_0 := (\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}, \eta_0, \eta_1)$ used in the conditions, and on α_0 where $1 - \alpha_0$ is the confidence level of the statement.

We assume that we can take γ_0 sufficiently small. Moreover, we state the results with $\alpha_0 := (4/p) \wedge .05$ to avoid digressions concerning the confidence level. Explicit expressions can be found in Theorem 7.4, where we simplified the situation by assuming n is sufficiently large and $\log p/n$ is sufficiently small.

With the notation $z = \mathcal{O}(1)$ we mean that z can be bounded by a constant depending only on σ_0 and $\Lambda_{\min}$. Moreover, with $z \asymp 1$ we mean $z = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $1/z = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Furthermore, the Frobenius norm is defined as $\|B\|_F = (\sum_{j,k=1}^p |\beta_{k,j}|^2)^{1/2}$ for a $p \times p$ matrix B with elements $\beta_{k,j}$.

Theorem 3.1 *Assume Conditions 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5, with $\gamma_0 := (\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}, \eta_0, \eta_1)$ sufficiently small, but allowing $1/\|\gamma_0\|_1 = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Let $1 - \alpha_0$ be the confidence level, with $\alpha_0 := (4/p) \wedge .05$. Then for a choice*

$$\lambda^2 \asymp \frac{\log p}{n} \left(\frac{p}{s_0} \vee 1 \right),$$

it holds that with probability at least $1 - \alpha_0$,

$$\|\hat{B} - \tilde{B}_0\|_F^2 + \|\hat{\Omega} - \tilde{\Omega}_0\|_F^2 = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2 s_0),$$

where $(\tilde{B}_0, \tilde{\Omega}_0)$ are defined in Section 2.2, and

$$\hat{s} \asymp \tilde{s} \asymp s_0.$$

The proof is given in Section 7. Theorem 7.4 gives some explicit bounds.

Remark 3.1 *If the beta-min condition (Condition 3.5) holds with $\eta_1 = 0$ and with very small values for $\eta_0 := \eta_0(\pi)$, namely of order $1/\tilde{s}(\pi)$, then one obtains the screening property: all edges in $(\tilde{B}_0, \tilde{\Omega}_0)$ are then with large probability also present in $(\hat{B}, \hat{\Omega})$.*

Moreover, by taking $\lambda^2 := \lambda^2(s_0)$ very large (of order $s_0 \log p/n$), one can obtain with large probability that $\hat{s} \leq s_0$. In other words, by imposing a strong beta-min condition, which is severe if s_0 is large, one recovers with high probability the edges of the minimal-edge I-MAP exactly. However, in Theorem 3.1, we do not use such values for η_0 and λ , but instead $\lambda^2 \asymp \log p/n$ (when $p = \mathcal{O}(s_0)$) and $\eta_0 \asymp 1$. Thus, we generally do not recover the true edges. This is the price for dealing with a large p situation and an s_0 possibly growing in n . Such problems do not show up in asymptotics with p fixed.

Remark 3.2 *To avoid technical digressions in our proofs, we assume a Gaussian distribution for the observations where zero correlations mean independence. We use in Lemma 7.4 that if for some $\tilde{\epsilon}_j$, $\mathbb{E}\tilde{\epsilon}_j = 0$, then also the conditional expectation of $\tilde{\epsilon}_j$ given variables X_k that are uncorrelated with $\tilde{\epsilon}_j$ is zero. In the non-Gaussian case, this is no longer true. However, one can still derive similar results, along a line of proof that does not use conditioning but instead concentration inequalities for averages of products of random variables (empirical covariances). This means that our results go through for observations which are sub-Gaussian. The proofs then rely on concentration*

inequalities of Bernstein-type. As generally the observations are not bounded, one cannot directly apply elegant concentration inequalities from the literature such as Bousquet's inequality [Bousquet, 2002]. For the unbounded case, there are however the results in van de Geer and Lederer [2011] which can be used.

4 A discussion of the conditions

4.1 Bounds for the noise variances

For all π and j and for any β_j with $\beta_{j,j} = 0$, we have $\|X_j - X\beta_j\| = \|X\beta_j^-\|$ where $\beta_{k,j}^- = -\beta_{k,j}$ for $k \neq j$ and $\beta_{j,j}^- = 1$. It follows that for any π and j ,

$$|\tilde{\omega}_j^0(\pi)|^2 = \|X_j - X\tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi)\|^2 \geq \Lambda_{\min}^2,$$

with $\Lambda_{\min}^2$ the smallest eigenvalue of Σ_0 . Moreover, clearly $|\tilde{\omega}_j^0(\pi)|^2 \leq \sigma_j^2$. Hence, Conditions 3.1 and 3.2 imply that for all π and j

$$0 < \Lambda_{\min}^2 \leq |\tilde{\omega}_j^0(\pi)|^2 \leq \sigma_0^2.$$

Furthermore, $\Lambda_{\min}^2 > 0$ is implied by

$$\min_j |\omega_j^0|^2 > 0, \tag{7}$$

since $\det(\Sigma_0) = \det(\Omega_0) = \prod_{j=1}^p \omega_j^0$. Thus, Condition 3.2 is equivalent to (7).

4.2 Overfitting

Condition 3.3 will ensure that the penalized minus log-likelihood cannot become minus infinity. If n or more edges are allowed at a node, say at node j , the estimator will overfit the data at this node, giving a residual variance $\hat{\omega}_j^2 = 0$. The penalized minus log-likelihood is proportional to $\sum_{j=1}^p \log \hat{\omega}_j^2 + \lambda^2 \hat{s}$ which will be $-\infty$ if one allows that $\hat{\omega}_j$ vanishes. Note that the penalty as such does not prevent this type of overfitting. Therefore, we need a restriction on the class of possible DAGs, and Condition 3.3 serves this purpose. We will show in Lemma 7.5 that Conditions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 imply that for an appropriate constant $K_0 > 0$, it holds for all j that $\hat{\omega}_j \geq 1/K_0$ with large probability.

4.3 The beta-min condition

One may circumvent the beta-min condition if one allows for edges with weights below some noise level λ_* to be set to zero. Here, $\lambda_* := \sqrt{\log p/n}/\eta_0^*$ for some suitable $\eta_0^* > 0$. Instead of trying to estimate the true DAG (B_0, Ω_0) , one now aims at estimating its best sparse approximation (B_0^*, Ω_0^*) , which is defined as follows. Let for any DAG (B, Ω) , and for $\Theta = \Theta(B, \Omega)$, the weights $B_\Theta(\pi)$

be obtained by doing the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization for $\|\cdot\|_\Sigma$, where $\Sigma = \Theta^{-1}$, and $\|X\beta\|_\Sigma^2 := \beta^T \Sigma \beta$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Thus $B_\Theta(\pi)$ is lower-diagonal after the permutation π of its rows and columns, and for appropriate $\Omega_\Theta(\pi)$, the DAG $(B_\Theta(\pi), \Omega_\Theta(\pi))$ satisfies

$$\Theta = \Theta(B_\Theta(\pi), \Omega_\Theta(\pi)).$$

Let $s_\Theta(\pi) := s_{B_\Theta(\pi)}$ be the number of edges of $B_\Theta(\pi)$. Connecting this with our previous notation, we note that

$$B_{\Theta_0}(\pi) = \tilde{B}_0(\pi), \quad \Omega_{\Theta_0}(\pi) = \tilde{\Omega}_0(\pi), \quad s_{\Theta_0}(\pi) = \tilde{s}(\pi).$$

Let now for some constant $\eta_0^* > 0$,

$$s_\Theta^*(\pi) := \#\left\{(k, j) : |\beta_{\Theta, k, j}(\pi)| > \sqrt{\log p/n}(\sqrt{p/s_\Theta(\pi)} \vee 1)/\eta_0^*\right\}.$$

We then take

$$\Theta_0^* := \arg \min \{l(\Theta) : \Theta = (B, \Omega) \text{ a DAG, } s_\Theta^*(\pi) \geq (1 - \eta_1^*)s_\Theta(\pi), \forall \pi\},$$

where $0 \leq \eta_1^* < 1$ and $l(\Theta) = \text{trace}(\Theta \Sigma_0) - \log \det(\Theta) = \mathbb{E}l_n(\Theta)$ is the theoretical counterpart of the minus log-likelihood. (Note that $\Theta_0 := \Sigma_0^{-1}$ is the overall minimizer of $l(\Theta)$.) We let (B_0^*, Ω_0^*) be a solution of

$$\Theta_0^* = \Theta_0^*(B_0^*, \Omega_0^*)$$

with the minimum number of edges. With constants η_0^* and η_1^* sufficient small, one may replace $\Theta_0 = \Theta_0(B_0, \Omega_0)$ by $\Theta_0^* = \Theta_0^*(B_0^*, \Omega_0^*)$ in our analysis. In this way, one can avoid the beta-min condition, provided that the bias term that will now appear in the bounds is small enough.

4.3.1 The beta-min condition and the number of edges

We further note that Conditions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.5 imply Condition 3.4 with

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \frac{\sigma_0^2 \eta_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2 (1 - \eta_1)}. \quad (8)$$

This is because for all j ,

$$\frac{(1 - \eta_1) \tilde{s}_j(\pi) \log p}{\eta_0^2 n} \leq \|\tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi)\|_2^2 \leq \|X \tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi)\|^2 / \Lambda_{\min}^2 \leq \sigma_0^2 / \Lambda_{\min}^2.$$

4.4 The high sparsity regime where $s_0 \ll p$

The reason why we see a term $p/s_0 \vee 1$ appearing in the tuning parameter λ^2 (see Theorem 3.1) and in the beta-min condition (Condition 3.5) is due to the estimation of the p unknown variances, which gives a term of order $p \log p/n$ in

our bounds for the squared Frobenius norm. If $s_0 \ll p$, the true DAG has many disconnected components, and in fact it then has many isolated points. The variables in one component are uncorrelated with those in another component. We see this in the zeroes in the matrix Σ_0 . The connected components and isolated points are easily detected by Σ_n , assuming that non-zero correlations are at least $\sqrt{\log p/n}/\eta_c$ in absolute value for an appropriate (sufficiently small) constant η_c . Then we can do the analysis connected component by connected component. To summarize, the situation $p = \mathcal{O}(s_0)$ appears to be the most interesting. Alternatively, when the noise variances Ω_0 are known up to a scalar (for example if it is known that all noise variances are equal), we need not estimate these variances anymore and the term of order $p \log p/n$ does not appear in the bounds, provided an identifiability condition on the noise variances holds and p is sufficiently smaller than $n/\log n$. This will be shown in the next section.

5 The case of equal variances

Suppose that the noise variances $\{|\omega_j^0|^2\}_{j=1}^p$ are known up to a multiplicative scalar. To simplify the exposition, let us assume that

$$\omega_1^0 = \dots = \omega_p^0 = 1.$$

The ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimator now becomes

$$\hat{B} := \arg \min \left\{ \text{trace} \left((I - B)(I - B)^T \Sigma_n \right) + \lambda^2 s_B : \right. \\ \left. (B, I) \text{ a DAG, } B \in \mathcal{B} \right\}, \quad (9)$$

where B is as in (6).

The main Theorem 3.1 as well as the remarks in Section 3.1 apply to the estimator (9) as well, assuming exactly the same Conditions 3.1 - 3.5.

For the case where $p = \mathcal{O}(n/\log(n))$ is sufficiently small, we obtain consistent estimation of the true underlying DAG and we gain in comparison to the main Theorem 3.1 by excluding the additional factor $(p/s_0 \vee 1)$. We make the following assumptions.

Condition 5.1 *There exists a constant $\eta_\omega > 0$ such that for all $\tilde{\Omega}_0(\pi) \neq I$,*

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \left(|\tilde{\omega}_j^0(\pi)|^2 - 1 \right)^2 > 1/\eta_\omega.$$

Condition 5.2 *There exists a constant α_* such that*

$$p \leq \alpha_* n / \log n.$$

We call Condition 5.1 the “omega-min” condition. It leads to identification of the DAG with equal variances. Condition 5.2 ensures that the rate of convergence is fast enough to ensure that eventually we choose the right permutation. Note that it implies Conditions 3.3 and 3.4, with $\alpha = \tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_*$.

Let π_0 be defined by $\tilde{B}_0(\pi_0) = B_0$. Since B_0 is identifiable from the observational distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$ [Peters and Bühlmann, 2012], see also Section 2.1.1, π_0 corresponds to the unique true ordering of the variables.

Theorem 5.1 *Assume Conditions 3.1 and 3.2, and Conditions 5.1 and 5.2. Let $\alpha_0 := (4/p) \wedge .05$. Then for $\gamma_* := (\alpha_*, \eta_\omega)$ suitably small, but allowing $1/\|\gamma_*\|_1 = \mathcal{O}(1)$, and for $\lambda^2 \asymp \log p/n$, it holds with probability at least $1 - \alpha_0$, that $\hat{\pi} = \pi_0$, and*

$$\|\hat{B} - B_0\|_F^2 + \lambda^2 \hat{s} = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2 s_0).$$

The proof is given in Subsection 7.5.

Thus, we find $\hat{s} = \mathcal{O}(s_0)$, but we do not show $\hat{s} \asymp s_0$. To establish the latter, one again needs a beta-min condition, but this time only on the DAG (B_0, I) , and not on any of the other representations $(\tilde{B}_0(\pi), \tilde{\Omega}_0(\pi))$ with $\pi \neq \pi_0$. This is a much simplified and weaker assumption than in Condition 3.5. Furthermore, choosing $\lambda \asymp s_0 \log p/n$ sufficiently large, exact edge recovery follows by the beta-min condition for the true DAG (B_0, I) , that is, the condition that $\min\{|\beta_{k,j}^0| : \beta_{k,j} \neq 0\} > s_0 \sqrt{\log p/n}/\eta^0$ for some sufficiently small $\eta^0 > 0$.

6 Conclusions

We establish the first results of the ℓ_0 -penalized MLE for estimation of the minimal-edge I-MAP (the smallest DAG which can generate the data-generating distribution) in the high-dimensional sparse setting. Thereby, we avoid the strong-faithfulness condition (2) or its restricted version (3); the latter is required for consistency of the PC-algorithm [Spirtes et al., 2000]. The strong-faithfulness condition is typically very restrictive [Uhler et al., 2012] and hence, our results contribute in relaxing such very restrictive assumptions.

Our main assumption is Condition 3.5 (which implies the sparsity Condition 3.4, see Section 4.3.1): Example 2.1 fulfills it, even if $p \gg n$. The noise level is of the order $\sqrt{\log(p)/n(p/s_0 \vee 1)}$: the additional factor $(p/s_0 \vee 1)$ occurs due to estimation of p variances in Ω_0 . However, the interesting scenario is for the case where $s_0 \geq \text{const.} \cdot p$ since $s_0 \ll p$ corresponds to a DAG where most nodes are isolated having no edges to other nodes; thus, for $s_0 \geq \text{const.} \cdot p$, we obtain the usual noise level of the order $\sqrt{\log(p)/n}$, as in high-dimensional regression problems.

For the equal variance case with $p = \mathcal{O}(n/\log(n))$ sufficiently small, our result in Theorem 5.1 (and its comment below) is most clear in that we essentially only require the beta-min Condition 3.5 for the true DAG B_0 , and the identifiability

Condition 5.1 for the error variances: we can then recover the true underlying unique DAG B_0 . Thus, we have identified an important class of models where estimation of the order of variables and the true underlying DAG is possible without requiring the very restrictive strong-faithfulness condition (2) or (3).

7 Proofs

7.1 Bounds on a subset of the probability space

We present some explicit bounds assuming we are on a set of the form $\cap_{k=0}^3 \mathcal{T}_k$, where the sets $\mathcal{T}_k$ are defined below. Then we show in Subsections 7.3.1, 7.3.2 and 7.3.3 that each $\mathcal{T}_k$, $k = 0, \dots, 3$ has large probability for an appropriate choice of the constants and of the parameters λ_1 , λ_2 and λ_3 involved in the definition of these sets. In fact, we will show that one can take

$$\lambda_1 \asymp \lambda_2 \asymp \lambda_3 \asymp \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}.$$

Let for some constant $K_0 > 0$,

$$\mathcal{T}_0 := \{\hat{\omega}_j^2 \geq 1/K_0^2, \forall j\}.$$

Let us write $X_k \perp \tilde{\epsilon}_j$ if X_k and $\tilde{\epsilon}_j$ are independent. For all π and j , define $\tilde{\epsilon}_j(\pi) = X_j - X\tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi)$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_j(\pi) := \{\beta_j : X_k \perp \tilde{\epsilon}_j(\pi), \forall \beta_{k,j} \neq 0\}$. Moreover, let $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\pi) := \{B = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p) \in \mathcal{B} : \beta_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_j(\pi) \forall j\}$. For some $\delta_1 > 0$ and some $\lambda_1 > 0$, write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_1 := \left\{ 2 \sum_{j=1}^p |\tilde{\epsilon}_j^T(\pi) X(\beta_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi))|/n \leq \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^p \|X(\beta_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi))\|_n^2 \right. \\ \left. + \lambda_1^2(s + \tilde{s}(\pi))/\delta_1, \forall B = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p) \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\pi), \forall \pi \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

We let for some $\lambda_2 > 0$,

$$\mathcal{T}_2 := \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\|\tilde{\epsilon}_j(\pi)\|_n^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0(\pi)|^2}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0(\pi)|^2} \right)^2 \leq 4\lambda_2^2(p + \tilde{s}(\pi)), \forall \pi \right\},$$

where we use the notation

$$\|v\|_n^2 := v^T v/n, \quad v \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Finally, for some $\delta_3 > 0$ and some $\lambda_3 > 0$, let $\mathcal{T}_3$ be the set

$$\mathcal{T}_3 := \left\{ \|X\beta\|_n \geq \left[\delta_3 - \lambda_3 \sqrt{s_\beta} \right] \|\beta\|_2, \forall \beta \right\}.$$

Recall that $s_\beta := \#\{\beta_k \neq 0\}$.

Lemma 7.1 Define $(\tilde{B}_0, \tilde{\Omega}_0) := (B_0(\hat{\pi}), \Omega_0(\hat{\pi}))$ and $\tilde{s} := s_{\tilde{B}_0}$. Assume that Condition 3.1 holds. Suppose we are on $\cap_{k=0}^2 \mathcal{T}_k$ with $0 < \delta_1 < 1/K_0^2$ and $0 < \delta_2 < 1/(2K_0^4\sigma_0^4)$. Take the tuning parameter $\lambda^2 > \lambda_1^2/\delta_1 + \lambda_2^2/\delta_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{K_0^2} - \delta_1 \right) \sum_{j=1}^p \|X(\hat{\beta}_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)\|_n^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2K_0^4\sigma_0^4} - \delta_2 \right) \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\hat{\omega}_j^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\hat{\omega}_j|^2} \right)^2 \\ & + \left(\lambda^2 - \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\delta_1} - \frac{\lambda_2^2}{\delta_2} \right) \hat{s} \leq \lambda^2 s_0 + \frac{\lambda_2^2(p + \tilde{s})}{\delta_2} + \frac{\lambda_1^2 \tilde{s}}{\delta_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{\epsilon} := \tilde{\epsilon}(\hat{\pi})$. We apply the Basic Inequality

$$l_n(\hat{\Theta}) + \lambda^2 \hat{s} \leq l_n(\Theta_0) + \lambda^2 s_0,$$

or equivalently

$$p + \sum_{j=1}^p \log \hat{\omega}_j^2 + \lambda^2 \hat{s} \leq \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\|\epsilon_j\|_n^2}{|\omega_j^0|^2} + \sum_{j=1}^p \log |\omega_j^0|^2 + \lambda^2 s_0.$$

which gives, using $\log(\det(\Sigma_0)) = \sum_{j=1}^p \log |\omega_j^0|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^p \log |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \log \left(\frac{\hat{\omega}_j^2}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2} \right) + \lambda^2 \hat{s} \leq \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\|\epsilon_j\|_n^2}{|\omega_j^0|^2} - 1 \right) + \lambda^2 s_0.$$

Since $\hat{\omega}_j^2 \geq 1/K_0^2$ (since we are on $\mathcal{T}_0$) and $|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 \leq \sigma_0^2$ (by Condition 3.1), we know that

$$\frac{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{\hat{\omega}_j^2} \leq K_0^2 \sigma_0^2.$$

But then, using

$$\log(1+x) \leq x - \frac{1}{2(1+c)^2} x^2, \quad -1 < x \leq c,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \left(\frac{\hat{\omega}_j^2}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2} \right) = -\log \left(\frac{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\hat{\omega}_j|^2} \right) \\ & \geq -\left(\frac{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\hat{\omega}_j|^2} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{2K_0^4\sigma_0^4} \left(\frac{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\hat{\omega}_j|^2} - 1 \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

We plug this back into the Basic Inequality to get

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\hat{\omega}_j^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\hat{\omega}_j|^2} + \frac{1}{2K_0^4\sigma_0^4} \left(\frac{\hat{\omega}_j^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\hat{\omega}_j|^2} \right)^2 + \lambda^2 \hat{s} \leq \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\|\epsilon_j\|_n^2}{|\omega_j^0|^2} - 1 \right) + \lambda^2 s_0.$$

Rewrite this to

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\|X(\hat{\beta}_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)\|_n^2}{\hat{\omega}_j^2} + \frac{1}{2K_0^4\sigma_0^4} \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\hat{\omega}_j^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\hat{\omega}_j|^2} \right)^2 + \lambda^2 \hat{s}$$

$$\leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\tilde{\epsilon}_j^T X(\hat{\beta}_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)/n}{\hat{\omega}_j^2} + \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\|\epsilon_j\|_n^2}{|\omega_j^0|^2} - 1 \right) - \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\|\tilde{\epsilon}_j\|_n^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\hat{\omega}_j|^2} \right) + \lambda^2 s_0.$$

We now apply

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\|\tilde{\epsilon}_j\|_n^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\hat{\omega}_j|^2} \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\|\tilde{\epsilon}_j\|_n^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\|\tilde{\epsilon}_j\|_n^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2} \right) \left(\frac{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - \hat{\omega}_j^2}{\hat{\omega}_j^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

But, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and using that we are on $\mathcal{T}_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\|\tilde{\epsilon}_j\|_n^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2} \right) \left(\frac{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - \hat{\omega}_j^2}{\hat{\omega}_j^2} \right) \right| \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\|\tilde{\epsilon}_j\|_n^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - \hat{\omega}_j^2}{\hat{\omega}_j^2} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq 2\sqrt{(p + \tilde{s})\lambda_2^2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - \hat{\omega}_j^2}{\hat{\omega}_j^2} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \frac{(p + \tilde{s})\lambda_2^2}{\delta_2} + \delta_2 \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - \hat{\omega}_j^2}{\hat{\omega}_j^2} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking $\text{trace}(\Theta_0 \Sigma_n) = \text{trace}(\tilde{\Theta}_0 \Sigma_n)$, that is

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\|\epsilon_j\|_n^2}{|\omega_j^0|^2} = \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\|\tilde{\epsilon}_j\|_n^2}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2},$$

and using that we are on $\mathcal{T}_1$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{K_0^2} - \delta_1 \right) \sum_{j=1}^p \|X(\hat{\beta}_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)\|_n^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2K_0^4 \sigma_0^4} - \delta_2 \right) \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\hat{\omega}_j^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\hat{\omega}_j|^2} \right)^2 + \left(\lambda^2 - \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\delta_1} \right) \hat{s} \\ & \leq \lambda^2 s_0 + \frac{\lambda_2^2 (p + \tilde{s})}{\delta_2} + \frac{\lambda_1^2 \tilde{s}}{\delta_1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

7.2 Exploiting the beta-min condition

Lemma 7.2 *Let $\tilde{s} = s_{\tilde{B}}$ be the number of edges of $\tilde{B}_0$ and $\hat{s} = s_{\hat{B}_0}$ be the number of edges of $\hat{B}$. Suppose that for some $\tilde{\lambda}$,*

$$\|\hat{B} - \tilde{B}_0\|_F \leq \tilde{\lambda}\sqrt{\tilde{s}},$$

and that for some constant $0 \leq \eta_1 < 1$ and $0 < \eta_2^2 < 1 - \eta_1$

$$\#\{|\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}^0| \geq \tilde{\lambda}/\eta_2\} \geq (1 - \eta_1)\tilde{s}.$$

Then $\hat{s} \geq (1 - \eta_1 - \eta_2^2)\tilde{s}$.

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{N} := \{(k, j) : |\hat{\beta}_{k,j}| \geq \tilde{\lambda}/\eta_2\}, \quad \mathcal{M} := \{(k, j) : |\hat{\beta}_{k,j} - \tilde{\beta}_{k,j}^0| > \tilde{\lambda}/\eta_2\}.$$

Then for $(k, j) \in \mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{M}^c$ it holds that

$$|\hat{\beta}_{k,j}| \geq |\tilde{\beta}_{k,j}^0| - |\hat{\beta}_{k,j} - \tilde{\beta}_{k,j}^0| > 0,$$

so that $\hat{s} \geq |\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{M}^c|$. Since $\|\hat{B} - \tilde{B}_0\|_F \leq \tilde{\lambda}\sqrt{\tilde{s}}$, we must have

$$\sum_{(k,j) \in \mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{M}} |\hat{\beta}_{k,j} - \tilde{\beta}_{k,j}^0|^2 \leq \sum_{(k,j)} |\hat{\beta}_{k,j} - \tilde{\beta}_{k,j}^0|^2 = \|\hat{B} - \tilde{B}_0\|_F^2 \leq \tilde{\lambda}^2 \tilde{s},$$

whereas

$$\sum_{(k,j) \in \mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{M}} |\hat{\beta}_{k,j} - \tilde{\beta}_{k,j}^0|^2 > |\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{M}| \tilde{\lambda}^2 / \eta_2^2.$$

Hence,

$$|\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{M}| \leq \eta_2^2 \tilde{s}.$$

This gives

$$|\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{M}^c| = |\mathcal{N}| - |\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{M}| \geq (1 - \eta_1)\tilde{s} - \eta_2^2 \tilde{s} = (1 - \eta_1 - \eta_2^2)\tilde{s}.$$

□

Lemma 7.3 *Suppose that for some $\delta_B > 0$, $\delta_s > 0$, $\lambda_0 > 0$ and λ one has*

$$\delta_B \|\hat{B} - \tilde{B}_0\|_F^2 + \lambda^2 \delta_s \hat{s} \leq \lambda^2 s_0 + \lambda_0^2 \tilde{s},$$

where $\tilde{s} \geq s_0$. Let $\tilde{\lambda}^2 \delta_B \geq \lambda^2 + \lambda_0^2$ and assume that

$$\#\{|\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}^0| \geq \tilde{\lambda}/\eta_2\} \geq (1 - \eta_1)\tilde{s}.$$

Then

$$\delta_B \|\hat{B} - \tilde{B}_0\|_F^2 + \left(\lambda^2 \delta_s - \frac{\lambda_0^2}{1 - \eta_1^2 - \eta_2^2} \right) \hat{s} \leq \lambda^2 s_0,$$

and $\hat{s} \geq (1 - \eta_1 - \eta_2^2)s_0$.

Proof. Since $\tilde{s} \geq s_0$, we find that

$$\delta_B \|\hat{B} - \tilde{B}_0\|_F^2 \leq (\lambda^2 + \lambda_0^2) \tilde{s} \leq \delta_B \tilde{\lambda}^2 \tilde{s}.$$

This gives by Lemma 7.2

$$\hat{s} \geq (1 - \eta_1 - \eta_2^2) \tilde{s}.$$

But then

$$\delta_B \|\hat{B} - \tilde{B}_0\|_F^2 + \left(\lambda^2 \delta_s - \frac{\lambda_0^2}{1 - \eta_1 - \eta_2^2} \right) \hat{s} \leq \lambda^2 s_0.$$

□

7.3 The sets $\mathcal{T}_k$, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$

7.3.1 The set $\mathcal{T}_1$

Lemma 7.4 *Let Z be a fixed $n \times m$ matrix and $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n$ be independent $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_0^2)$ -distributed random variables. Then for all $t > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\|Z\beta\|_n \leq 1} |\varepsilon^T Z\beta|/n \geq \sigma_0(\sqrt{2m/n} + \sqrt{2t/n}) \right) \leq \exp[-t].$$

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that $Z^T Z/n = I$ and define $V_k := \varepsilon^T Z_k / (\sigma_0 \sqrt{n})$. Then $V_1, \dots, V_p$ are independent and $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ -distributed. It follows that for all $N \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$,

$$\mathbb{E}|V_k^2|^N = \frac{(2N)!}{2^N N!} \leq N!.$$

But then by Bernstein's inequality (see Bennet [1962]), for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{k=1}^m (V_k^2 - \mathbb{E}V_k^2) \geq 2\sqrt{tm} + 2t \right) \leq \exp[-t]. \quad (10)$$

Now use that $\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}V_k^2 = m$. We get

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{k=1}^m V_k^2 \geq m + 2\sqrt{tm} + 2t \right) \leq \exp[-t].$$

But

$$m + 2\sqrt{tm} + 2t \leq (\sqrt{2m} + \sqrt{2t})^2.$$

Furthermore,

$$\sup_{\|Z\beta\|_n \leq 1} |\varepsilon^T Z\beta|/n = \frac{\sigma_0}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^m V_k^2/n}.$$

□

We are dealing now with the problem of uniformly controlling over all permutations π . We consider the local structure at each node of a DAG $(\tilde{B}_0(\pi), \tilde{\Omega}_0(\pi))$ with $\tilde{B}_0(\pi) =: (\tilde{\beta}_{k,j}^0(\pi))$. Let $\tilde{S}_j(\pi)$ be the set of incoming edges at node j . Given $\tilde{S}_j(\pi)$, the vector $X\tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi)$ is the projection in $L_2(P)$ of X_j on the linear space spanned by $\{X_k\}_{k \in \tilde{S}_j(\pi)}$. Moreover, $\tilde{\epsilon}_j(\pi)$ is the anti-projection $\tilde{\epsilon}_j(\pi) = X_j - X\tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi)$. In other words (for j fixed) if the parents $\tilde{S}_j(\pi)$ at node j are given, then the coefficients $\tilde{\beta}_{k,j}^0(\pi)$ and noise term $\tilde{\epsilon}_j(\pi)$ are given as well. Also, the set of variables X_k that are independent of $\tilde{\epsilon}_j$ is then given. Recall that $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_j(\pi) := \{\beta_j : X_k \perp \tilde{\epsilon}_j(\pi), \forall \beta_{k,j} \neq 0\}$. Thus, for each fixed j , if $\tilde{S}_j(\pi)$ is given then the local situation $(\tilde{\epsilon}_j(\pi), \beta_j^0(\pi), \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_j(\pi))$ at node j is given.

Let $\Pi_j(m)$ be the collection of all permutations giving DAGs $(\tilde{B}_0(\pi), \tilde{\Omega}_0(\pi))$ with edges $(\tilde{S}_1(\pi), \dots, \tilde{S}_p(\pi))$ with $|\tilde{S}_j(\pi)| = m$. If for some $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, p\}$, we know that $\pi \in \Pi_j(m)$, that is, we know that node j has m parents, then there are at most $\binom{p}{m}$ possibilities for the local situation at node j .

Theorem 7.1 *Assume Condition 3.1. Then for all $t > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{\pi} \sup_{B \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\pi)} 2 \sum_{j=1}^p |\tilde{\epsilon}_j^T(\pi)(X(\beta_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi)))|/n - \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^p \|X(\beta_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi))\|_n^2 \right. \\ \left. \geq \frac{4\sigma_0^2(s_B + \tilde{s}(\pi))}{n\delta_1} + \frac{\sigma_0^2(t + 2\log p)(s_B + \tilde{s}(\pi))}{n\delta_1} \right) \\ \leq \exp[-t]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $A_j(\pi)$ be the event

$$\begin{aligned} A_j(\pi) &:= \left\{ \exists \beta_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_j(\pi) : \sup_{\|X(\beta_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi))\|_n \leq 1} |\tilde{\epsilon}_j^T(\pi)(X(\beta_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi)))|/n \right. \\ &\quad \left. \geq \sigma_0 \left(\sqrt{\frac{(2(s_{\beta_j} + \tilde{s}_j(\pi)))}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{2(t + \tilde{s}_j(\pi) \log p + 2\log p)}{n}} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Lemma 7.4, for all $t > 0$, π and j

$$\mathbb{P}(A_j(\pi)) \leq \exp[-(t + \tilde{s}_j(\pi) \log p + 2\log p)].$$

We now let π vary over all permutations such that $|\tilde{S}_j(\pi)| = m$. We then get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\cup_{\pi \in \Pi_j(m)} A_j(\pi)\right) \leq \binom{p}{m} \exp[-(t + m \log p + 2\log p)] \leq \exp[-(t + 2\log p)].$$

Next, we let π vary over all permutations. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\cup_{\pi} A_j(\pi)\right) &\leq \sum_{m=1}^p \max_{1 \leq m \leq p} \mathbb{P}\left(\cup_{\pi \in \Pi_j(m)} A_j(\pi)\right) \\ &\leq p \exp[-(t + 2\log p)] \leq \exp[-(t + \log p)]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\cup_{j=1}^p \cup_{\pi} A_j(\pi)) &\leq p \max_j \mathbb{P}(\cup_{\pi} A_j(\pi)) \\ &\leq p \exp[-(t + \log p)] \leq \exp[-t].\end{aligned}$$

Now, we use that for all $\delta_1 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}2\sigma_0 \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\sqrt{\frac{2(s_j + \tilde{s}_j)}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{2(t + \tilde{s}_j + 2\log p)}{n}} \right) \|X(\beta_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)\|_n \\ \leq \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^p \|X(\beta_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)\|_n^2 + \frac{4\sigma_0^2(s + \tilde{s})}{n\delta_1} + \frac{4\sigma_0^2(t + 2\log p)(s + \tilde{s})}{n\delta_1},\end{aligned}$$

where $s = \sum_{j=1}^p s_j$, $\tilde{s} = \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{s}_j$.

□

7.3.2 The set $\mathcal{T}_2$

Theorem 7.2 *Assume Condition 3.4. Then for all $t > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\exists \pi : \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\|\tilde{\epsilon}_j(\pi)\|_n^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0(\pi)|^2}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0(\pi)|^2} \right)^2 \right. \\ \left. \geq 8 \left(\frac{pt + (1 + 8\tilde{\alpha})\tilde{s}(\pi) \log p + 2p \log p}{n} \right) + 8 \left(\frac{4p(t^2 + \log^2 p)}{n^2} \right) \right) \\ \leq 2 \exp[-t].\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Define

$$Z_j(\pi) := \frac{\|\tilde{\epsilon}_j(\pi)\|_n^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0(\pi)|^2}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0(\pi)|^2}.$$

Using the same argument as in (10), we see that for each π , and for all $t > 0$.

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|Z_j(\pi)| \geq 2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + \frac{t}{n} \right) \right) \leq 2 \exp[-t].$$

Define

$$\mathbf{Z}_j(\pi) := \frac{|Z_j(\pi)|}{2a_j(\pi)},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}a_j(\pi) = \left(\sqrt{\frac{t + \tilde{s}_j(\pi) \log p + \log(1 + p) + \log p}{n}} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{t + \tilde{s}_j(\pi) \log p + \log(1 + p) + \log p}{n} \right).\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \max_{0 \leq m \leq p} \max_{\pi \in \Pi_j(m)} \mathbf{Z}_j(\pi) \geq 1 \right) \\ & \leq 2p(p+1) \binom{p}{m} \exp[-(t + m \log p + \log(1+p) + \log p)] \leq 2 \exp[-t]. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking $\log(1+p) \leq 2 \log p$, we see that with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp[-t]$, it holds that for all permutations π and all j ,

$$|Z_j(\pi)| \leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{t + \tilde{s}_j(\pi) \log p + 2 \log p}{n}} + \frac{t + \tilde{s}_j(\pi) \log p + 2 \log p}{n},$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^p |Z_j(\pi)|^2 & \leq 4 \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\sqrt{\frac{t + \tilde{s}_j(\pi) \log p + 2 \log p}{n}} + \frac{t + \tilde{s}_j(\pi) \log p + 2 \log p}{n} \right)^2 \\ & \leq 8 \left(\frac{pt + \tilde{s}(\pi) \log p + 2p \log p}{n} \right) + 8 \left(\frac{4pt^2 + 8 \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{s}_j^2(\pi) \log^2 p + 4p \log^2 p}{n^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we insert that for all j , $\tilde{s}_j(\pi) \leq \tilde{\alpha} n / (\log p)$, to find

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{s}_j^2(\pi) \log^2 p & \leq \sum_{j=1}^n (\tilde{\alpha} n / (\log p)) \tilde{s}_j(\pi) \log^2 p \\ & = \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{s}(\pi) n \log p. \end{aligned}$$

We then arrive at

$$\sum_{j=1}^p |Z_j(\pi)|^2 \leq 8 \left(\frac{pt + (1 + 8\tilde{\alpha}) \tilde{s}(\pi) \log p + 2p \log p}{n} \right) + 8 \left(\frac{4p(t^2 + \log^2 p)}{n^2} \right).$$

□

7.3.3 The sets $\mathcal{T}_3$ and $\mathcal{T}_0$

Theorem 7.3 *Assume Condition 3.1 and Condition 3.2. For all $t > 0$, with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp[-t]$,*

$$\|X\beta\|_n \geq \left[3\Lambda_{\min}/4 - \sqrt{\frac{2(t + \log p)}{n}} - 3\sigma_0 \sqrt{\frac{s_\beta \log p}{n}} \right] \|\beta\|_2,$$

uniformly in all $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

Proof.

We follow here the arguments used in Raskutti et al. [2010], which we slightly adjust to the style of the present paper. They show that for $\delta'_3 = 1/4$ (in fact for $\delta'_3 = o(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$), and for all $r > 0$

$$\mathbb{E} \inf_{\|\beta\|_1 \leq r, \|X\beta\|=1} \|X\beta\|_n \geq 1 - \delta'_3 - 3\sigma_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} r.$$

Hence, for all $1 \leq m \leq p$,

$$\mathbb{E} \inf_{s_\beta \leq m, \|\beta\|_2=1} \|X\beta\|_n \geq (1 - \delta'_3) \Lambda_{\min} - 3\sigma_0 \sqrt{\frac{m \log p}{n}}.$$

Apply the contraction inequality given in Massart [2003] to find that for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left[\mathbb{E} \inf_{s_\beta \leq m, \|\beta\|_2=1} \|X\beta\|_n \right] - \left[\inf_{s_\beta \leq m, \|\beta\|_2=1} \|X\beta\|_n \right] \geq \sqrt{\frac{2t}{n}} \right) \leq 2 \exp[-t].$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left[(1 - \delta'_3) \Lambda_{\min} - 3\sigma_0 \sqrt{\frac{m \log p}{n}} \right] - \left[\inf_{s_\beta \leq m, \|\beta\|_2=1} \|X\beta\|_n \right] \geq \sqrt{\frac{2t}{n}} \right) \leq 2 \exp[-t],$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\exists \beta : \left[(1 - \delta'_3) \Lambda_{\min} - 3\sigma_0 \sqrt{\frac{s_\beta \log p}{n}} \right] \|\beta\|_2 - \|X\beta\|_n \right. \\ \left. \geq \sqrt{\frac{2(t + \log p)}{n}} \|\beta\|_2 \right) \leq 2 \exp[-t]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 7.5 *Assume Conditions 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 and that*

$$1/K_0 := 3\Lambda_{\min}/4 - \sqrt{\frac{2(t + \log p)}{n}} - 3\sigma_0 \sqrt{\alpha + \tilde{\alpha}} > 0.$$

Let for some $t > 0$.

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_3 := \left\{ \|X\beta\|_n \leq \left[3\Lambda_{\min}/4 - \sqrt{\frac{2(t + \log p)}{n}} - 3\sigma_0 \sqrt{\frac{s_\beta \log p}{n}} \right] \|\beta\|_2, \forall \beta \right\}.$$

Then $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_3) \geq 1 - 2 \exp[-t]$ and one has on $\mathcal{T}_3$, for all $B = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p) \in \mathcal{B}$ and all π and all j ,

$$\|X(\beta_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi))\|_n \geq \|\beta_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0(\pi)\|_2 / K_0^2. \quad (11)$$

Moreover,

$$\hat{\omega}_j^2 \geq 1/K_0^2.$$

Proof. Theorem 7.3 states that $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_3) \geq 1 - 2 \exp[-t]$. Result (11) follows immediately, since $s_{\beta_j} + s_{\tilde{\beta}_j^0} \leq (\alpha + \tilde{\alpha})n/\log p$. For the last result, we define $\hat{\beta}_{k,j}^- := -\hat{\beta}_{k,j}$ for $k \neq j$ and $\hat{\beta}_{j,j}^- = 1$. Then on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_3$,

$$\hat{\omega}_j^2 = \|X\hat{\beta}_j^-\|_n^2 \geq \|\hat{\beta}_j^-\|_n / K_0^2 \geq 1/K_0^2.$$

□

7.4 Collecting the results

Lemma 7.6 Define $(\tilde{B}_0, \tilde{\Omega}_0) := (B_0(\hat{\pi}), \Omega_0(\hat{\pi}))$. Assume Conditions 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5. Suppose we are on $\cap_{k=0}^3 \mathcal{T}_k$ with $0 < \delta_1 < 1/K_0^2$ and $0 < \delta_2 < 1/(2K_0^4\sigma_0^4)$ and $\delta_3 - \lambda_3\sqrt{\alpha + \tilde{\alpha}}\sqrt{n/\log p} \geq 1/K_0 > 0$. Take the tuning parameter $\lambda^2 > \lambda_1^2/\delta_1 + \lambda_2^2/\delta_2$. Let

$$\delta_B \leq \frac{1}{K_0^2} \left(\frac{1}{K_0^2} - \delta_1 \right),$$

$$\delta_W \leq \frac{1}{K_0^2} \left(\frac{1}{2K_0^4\sigma_0^4} - \delta_2 \right),$$

$$\delta_s \leq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\lambda^2\delta_1} - \frac{\lambda_2^2}{\lambda^2\delta_2} \right),$$

and

$$\lambda_0^2 := \frac{(p/s_0 + 1)\lambda_2^2}{\delta_2} + \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\delta_1}.$$

Let $\tilde{\lambda}^2\delta_B := \lambda^2 + \lambda_0^2$, and $\eta_2^2 := \eta_0^2\tilde{\lambda}^2 n/\log p = \eta_0^2(\lambda^2 + \lambda_0^2)(n/\log p)/\delta_B^2$. Assume

$$\left(\lambda^2\delta_s - \frac{\lambda_0^2}{1 - \eta_1 - \eta_2^2} \right) := \lambda^2\delta_\eta > 0.$$

Then

$$\delta_B \|\hat{B} - \tilde{B}_0\|_F^2 + \delta_W \|\hat{\Omega} - \tilde{\Omega}_0\|_F^2 + \lambda^2\delta_\eta \hat{s} \leq \lambda^2 s_0,$$

and $\hat{s} \geq (1 - \eta_1 - \eta_2^2)\tilde{s} \geq (1 - \eta_1 - \eta_2^2)s_0$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.3. □

Lemma 7.7 Assume Conditions 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4, with

$$3\Lambda_{\min}/4 - \sqrt{\frac{2(t + \log p)}{n}} - 3\sigma_0\sqrt{\alpha + \tilde{\alpha}} \geq 1/K_0 > 0.$$

Take

$$\lambda_1^2 := \frac{4\sigma_0^2(1 + t + 2\log p)}{\log p} \frac{\log p}{n},$$

$$\lambda_2^2 := 4 \left(3 + 8\tilde{\alpha} + \frac{(t + 2\log p)}{\log p} + \frac{4(t^2 + \log^2 p)}{n \log p} \right) \frac{\log p}{n},$$

$$\lambda_3^2 := 9\sigma_0^2 \frac{\log p}{n},$$

and

$$\delta_3 := \frac{3}{4}\Lambda_{\min} - \sqrt{\frac{2(t + \log p)}{n}}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\cap_{k=0}^3 \mathcal{T}_k) \geq 1 - 4\exp[-t].$$

Proof. This follows from combining Theorem 7.1, Theorem 7.2 and Lemma 7.5.

□.

Theorem 7.4 *Assume Conditions 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5. Let us take $t = \log p$, giving $\alpha_0 = 4/p$ (suppose p is large). Take n sufficiently large, and $\log p/n$ bounded. Let*

$$c_1 := 96, \quad c_2 := 3840, \quad c = 4 \left(\frac{(p/s_0 + 1)c_2\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^4} + \frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2} \right) + 2 \left(\frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2} + \frac{c_2\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^4} \right).$$

Some possible choices for the constants are

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \tilde{\alpha} = \frac{\Lambda_{\min}^2}{288\sigma_0^2}, \quad K_0 := \frac{2}{\Lambda_{\min}}, \\ \delta_1 &:= \frac{\Lambda_{\min}^2}{8}, \quad \delta_2 := \frac{\Lambda_{\min}^4}{64\sigma_0^4}, \quad \delta_3 := \frac{\Lambda_{\min}}{2}. \\ \lambda^2 &:= c \frac{\log p}{n}, \quad \lambda_1^2 = 12\sigma_0^2 \frac{\log p}{n}, \quad \lambda_2^2 = 60 \frac{\log p}{n}, \quad \lambda_3^2 = 9\sigma_0^2 \frac{\log p}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\delta_B = \frac{\Lambda_{\min}^4}{32}, \quad \delta_W = \frac{\Lambda_{\min}^6}{256\sigma_0^4}, \quad \delta_s = \left(1 - \frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{c\Lambda_{\min}^2} - \frac{c_2\sigma_0^4}{c\Lambda_{\min}^4} \right).$$

We let

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0^2 &:= \left(\frac{(p/s_0 + 1)c_2\sigma_0^4}{\Lambda_{\min}^4} + \frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2} \right) \frac{\log p}{n}. \\ \tilde{\lambda}^2 &= \left(c + \frac{(p/s_0 + 1)c_2\sigma_0^4}{\Lambda_{\min}^4} + \frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2} \right) \frac{32}{\Lambda_{\min}^4} \frac{\log p}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\eta &= \frac{1}{2}, \quad \eta_1 = 0, \quad 2\eta_0^2 = \left(c + \frac{(p/s_0 + 1)c_2\sigma_0^4}{\Lambda_{\min}^4} + \frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2} \right)^{-1}, \\ \eta_2^2 &= \eta_0^2 \left(c + \frac{(p/s_0 + 1)c_2\sigma_0^4}{\Lambda_{\min}^4} + \frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2} \right) \frac{32}{\Lambda_{\min}^4}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. This follows from using some bounds and exact choices in Lemma 7.6 and Lemma 7.7. In particular, with $\lambda^2 = c \log p/n$, we take $\tilde{\lambda}^2 = (\lambda^2 + \lambda_0^2)/\delta_B$. With $\eta_1 = 0$ and $\delta_\eta = 1/2$, the equation

$$\left(\lambda^2 \delta_s - \frac{\lambda_0^2}{1 - \eta_2^2} \right) = \frac{\lambda^2}{2}$$

gives

$$\begin{aligned} &c \left(1 - \frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{c\Lambda_{\min}^2} - \frac{c_2\sigma_0^4}{c\Lambda_{\min}^4} \right) \\ &- \left(\frac{(p/s_0 + 1)c_2\sigma_0^4}{\Lambda_{\min}^4} + \frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2} \right) \left(1 - \eta_1 - \eta_0^2 \left(c + \frac{(p/s_0 + 1)c_2\sigma_0^4}{\Lambda_{\min}^4} + \frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2} \right) \right)^{-1} = \frac{c}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

With

$$2\eta_0^2 = \left(c + \frac{c_2\sigma_0^4}{\Lambda_{\min}^4} + \frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2} \right)^{-1}.$$

we have to solve for c

$$c \left(1 - \frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{c\Lambda_{\min}^2} - \frac{c_2\sigma_0^4}{c\Lambda_{\min}^4} \right) - 2 \left(\frac{(p/s_0 + 1)c_2\sigma_0^4}{\Lambda_{\min}^4} + \frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2} \right) = \frac{c}{2}.$$

This yields

$$c = 4 \left(\frac{(p/s_0 + 1)c_2\sigma_0^4}{\Lambda_{\min}^4} + \frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2} \right) + 2 \left(\frac{c_1\sigma_0^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2} + \frac{c_2\sigma_0^4}{\Lambda_{\min}^4} \right).$$

□

7.5 Proof of Theorem 5.1

We investigate what happens on the set $\cap_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{T}_3$ defined in Subsection 7.1. The results in Subsection 7.3 say that $\cap_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{T}_k$ has probability at least $4 \exp[-t]$ for a proper choice of the constants and parameters involved. Theorem 5.1 then follows directly.

Lemma 7.8 *Assume Condition 3.1, Condition 5.1 and Condition 5.2. Suppose we are on $\cap_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{T}_k$, with*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^2 &> \lambda_1^2/\delta_1, \\ \delta_3 - \lambda_3\sqrt{2\alpha_*} &\geq \frac{1}{K_0} > 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left(\frac{1}{2\sigma_0^4} - \delta_2 \right) \geq \eta_\omega \left(\frac{2\lambda_1^2}{\delta_2} + \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\delta_1} + \lambda^2 \right) \frac{\alpha_* n}{\log p}. \quad (12)$$

Then $\hat{\pi} = \pi_0$ and

$$\left(\frac{1 - \delta_1}{K_0^2} \right) \|\hat{B} - B_0\|_F^2 + \left(\lambda^2 - \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\delta_1} \right) \hat{s} \leq \left(\lambda^2 + \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\delta_1} \right) s_0.$$

Proof. We have

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \|X_j - X\hat{\beta}_j\|_n^2 + \lambda^2 \hat{s} \leq \sum_{j=1}^p \|\epsilon_j\|_n^2 + \lambda^2 s_0 = \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\|\tilde{\epsilon}_j\|_n^2}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}.$$

So we find

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \|X(\hat{\beta}_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)\|_n^2 + \lambda^2 \hat{s} \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{\epsilon}_j^T X(\hat{\beta}_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)/n + \sum_{j=1}^p \|\tilde{\epsilon}_j\|_n^2 \left(\frac{1}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2} - 1 \right) + \lambda^2 s_0.$$

We have

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \|\tilde{\epsilon}_j\|_n^2 \left(\frac{1}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2} - 1 \right) = \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\|\tilde{\epsilon}_j\|_n^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2} (|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - 1) + \sum_{j=1}^p (1 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2).$$

We know that

$$\log(\det(\Sigma_0)) = \sum_{j=1}^p \log |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^p \log |\omega_j^0|^2 = 0,$$

since $|\omega_j^0|^2 = 1$ for all j . Moreover

$$\log(1+x) \leq x - \frac{1}{2(1+c)^2} x^2, \quad -1 < x \leq c.$$

So, since $|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 \leq \sigma_0^2$,

$$\log |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 \leq (|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - 1) - \frac{1}{2\Sigma_0^4} (|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - 1)^2.$$

Hence

$$0 \leq \sum_{j=1}^p (|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - 1) - \frac{1}{2\sigma_0^4} \sum_{j=1}^p (|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - 1)^2.$$

This gives

$$\sum_{j=1}^p (1 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2) \leq -\frac{1}{2\sigma_0^4} \sum_{j=1}^p (|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - 1)^2.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^p \|X(\hat{\beta}_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)\|_n^2 + \frac{1}{2\sigma_0^4} \sum_{j=1}^p (|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - 1)^2 + \lambda^2 \hat{s} \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{\epsilon}_j^T X(\hat{\beta}_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)/n + \lambda^2 s_0 + \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\|\tilde{\epsilon}_j\|_n^2 - |\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2}{|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2} (|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - 1) \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{\epsilon}_j^T X(\hat{\beta}_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)/n + \lambda^2 s_0 + \frac{\lambda_2^2 p}{\delta_2} + \delta_2 \sum_{j=1}^p (|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - 1)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we invoked that we are on the set $\mathcal{T}_2$. We find

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^p \|X(\hat{\beta}_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)\|_n^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2\sigma_0^4} - \delta_2 \right) \sum_{j=1}^p (|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - 1)^2 + \lambda^2 \hat{s} \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{\epsilon}_j^T X(\hat{\beta}_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)/n + \lambda^2 s_0 + \frac{\lambda_2^2 p}{\delta_2}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives in a next step, using that we are on $\mathcal{T}_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \delta_1) \sum_{j=1}^p \|X(\hat{\beta}_j - \tilde{\beta}_j^0)\|_n^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2\sigma_0^4} - \delta_2 \right) \sum_{j=1}^p (|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - 1)^2 + \lambda^2 \hat{s} \\ & \leq \frac{\lambda_2^2(p + \tilde{s})}{\delta_2} + \frac{\lambda_1^2(\tilde{s} + \hat{s})}{\delta_1} + \lambda^2 s_0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using that we are on $\mathcal{T}_3$ and invoking Condition 5.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K_0^2}(1 - \delta_1)\|\hat{B} - B_0\|_F^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2\sigma_0^4} - \delta_2\right) \sum_{j=1}^p (|\tilde{\omega}_j^0|^2 - 1)^2 + \left(\lambda^2 - \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\delta_1}\right) \hat{s} \\ \leq \frac{\lambda_2^2(p + \tilde{s})}{\delta_2} + \frac{\lambda_1^2 \tilde{s}}{\delta_1} + \lambda^2 s_0 \\ \leq \left(\frac{2\lambda_2^2}{\delta_2} + \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\delta_1} + \lambda^2\right) p^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we use that $\tilde{s} \leq p^2$ and $s_0 \leq p^2$ (and also $p \leq p^2$). Since (using again Condition 5.2) $p \log p/n \leq \alpha_*$, and

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \left(|\tilde{\omega}_j|^2 - 1\right)^2 > p/\eta_\omega \text{ if } \hat{\pi} \neq \pi_0,$$

find that if $\hat{\pi} \neq \pi_0$,

$$\left(\frac{1}{2\sigma_0^4} - \delta_2\right) \frac{p}{\eta_\omega} < \left(\frac{2\lambda_2^2}{\delta_2} + \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\delta_1} + \lambda^2\right) \alpha_* \frac{n}{\log p},$$

which is in contradiction with Condition 5.1 and the further condition (12) imposed in this lemma. So we must have $\hat{\pi} = \pi_0$, and thus $\tilde{\omega}_j^0 = 1$ for all j . The result now follows from restarting the proof with $\tilde{\omega}_j^0 = 1$ for all j plugged in.

□

References

- S.A. Andersson, D. Madigan, and M.D. Perlman. A characterization of Markov equivalence classes for acyclic digraphs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 25:505–541, 1997.
- G. Bennet. Probability inequalities for sums of independent random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 57:33–45, 1962.
- O. Bousquet. A Bennet concentration inequality and its application to suprema of empirical processes. *Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Sciences, Paris*, 334:495–550, 2002.
- P. Bühlmann and S. van de Geer. *Statistics for High-Dimensional Data: Methods, Theory and Applications*. Springer, 2011.
- D.M. Chickering. Optimal structure identification with greedy search. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:507–554, 2002.
- A. Hauser and P. Bühlmann. Characterization and greedy learning of interventional Markov equivalence classes of directed acyclic graphs, 2011. arXiv:1104.2808.

- M. Kalisch and P. Bühlmann. Estimating high-dimensional directed acyclic graphs with the PC-algorithm. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8: 613–636, 2007.
- S. Lauritzen. *Graphical Models*. Oxford University Press, 1996.
- M.H. Maathuis, M. Kalisch, and P. Bühlmann. Estimating high-dimensional intervention effects from observational data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37: 3133–3164, 2009.
- M.H. Maathuis, D. Colombo, M. Kalisch, and P. Bühlmann. Predicting causal effects in large-scale systems from observational data. *Nature Methods*, 7: 247–248, 2010.
- P. Massart. Concentration inequalities and model selection. Lectures from the 33rd Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 6–23, 2003. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 2003.
- J. Pearl. *Causality: Models, Reasoning and Inference*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- J. Peters and P. Bühlmann. Identifiability of Gaussian structural equation models with same error variances, 2012. arXiv:1205.2536.
- G. Raskutti, M.J. Wainwright, and B. Yu. Restricted eigenvalue properties for correlated Gaussian designs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11: 2241–2259, 2010.
- J.M. Robins, R. Scheines, P. Spirtes, and L. Wasserman. Uniform consistency in causal inference. *Biometrika*, 90:491–515, 2003.
- A. Shojaie and G. Michailidis. Penalized likelihood methods for estimation of sparse high-dimensional directed acyclic graphs. *Biometrika*, 97:519–538, 2010.
- T. Silander and P. Myllymäki. A simple approach for finding the globally optimal bayesian network structure. In *UAI*, pages 445–452, 2006.
- P. Spirtes, C. Glymour, and R. Scheines. *Causation, Prediction, and Search*. MIT Press, second edition, 2000.
- C. Uhler, G. Raskutti, P. Bühlmann, and B. Yu. Geometry of faithfulness assumption in causal inference, 2012. Preprint.
- S. van de Geer and J. Lederer. The Bernstein-Orlicz norm and deviation inequalities. *Submitted*, 2011. available at arXiv 1111.2450.
- J. Zhang and P. Spirtes. Strong faithfulness and uniform consistency in causal inference. In *UAI*, pages 632–639, 2003.